

June 14, 1965

12921

The effect of these educational programs has reached, directly or indirectly, into practically every American home. This program, together with the World War II program for veterans' education, has been called the largest mass adult education and training program ever undertaken, and the full impact on the economy of the country in increased earnings, the value of the increase in the number of skilled and professional manpower, reduced unemployment, and other benefits has not been fully measured.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 235 will repeal as obsolete the provisions of chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code, which is commonly referred to as the educational benefits of the Korean GI bill. Inasmuch as the education program under the Korean GI bill terminated January 31, 1965, there is no reason for the continuation of this obsolete law as a part of title 38. Those provisions of the law which remain in effect are, under provisions of this bill, transferred to other chapters of title 38. There is no cost attached to the bill and the Veterans' Administration recommends its adoption. I urge its approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIZE OF FLAGS FURNISHED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2656) to amend subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Each such flag shall measure five feet in width and nine and one-half feet in length."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill will prescribe as the size of the flag, given by the Veterans' Administration to drape the caskets of deceased veterans, as 5 feet in width and 9½ feet in length.

In 1963, an administrative decision was made to reduce the size of the flag to 4½ by 7 feet. This decision was approved by the Administrator of General Services under date of May 27, 1963, and flags of this size are now being used by the Veterans' Administration.

There have been numerous complaints from veterans' organizations and recipients of the flag as to its size, that the present size does not actually cover the entire casket at the time of the funeral.

This legislation would require the Veterans' Administration to revert to its former practice of issuing the flag of 5 by 9½ feet and it is estimated it would cost 40 cents additional for each of the 180,000 flags issued each year for a total cost of \$72,000 per year.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 2656, will prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Veterans' Administration to drape the caskets of deceased veterans.

Until 1963, the flag in use for this purpose was 5 by 9½ feet. A flag of this size was adequate to cover the casket. In 1963 the Veterans' Administration arbitrarily reduced the size of the flag to 4½ by 7 feet. Complaints have been received by Members of Congress from veterans' organizations and the next of kin of deceased veterans that the flag being used was entirely too small to adequately cover the casket. I concur in these complaints and believe that the slight additional cost of the larger flag is most certainly warranted. I therefore recommend the passage of H.R. 2656.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2656, a bill to prescribe the size of burial flags. For many years the standard size of the burial flag was 5 feet by 9½ feet. This size is also used by the military and experience has shown this is the size needed to carry out the proper burial ritual by veterans organizations.

In 1963 the size of the flag issued by the Veterans' Administration was arbitrarily reduced to 4½ by 7 feet. Hundreds of complaints have been received from veterans organizations.

In the 88th Congress I introduced legislation to correct this action by the Veterans' Administration. Again in the 89th Congress I introduced H.R. 1725, a bill similar to H.R. 2656 in text, that will amend the code and provide a 5- by 9½-foot flag for burial purposes.

I strongly support this needed change as incorporated in H.R. 2656.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHICAGO'S RECEPTION TO ASTRONAUTS HITS ALLTIME RECORD

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a day in history. Chicago is doing honors to Astronauts Edward White and James McDivitt in a celebration that probably sets an alltime record in the number of persons participating and depth of enthusiasm. From the Congress of the United States goes warmest congratulations to Mayor Richard J. Daley and the people of Chicago.

PERSECUTION AND HARASSMENT OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the news that persecution and harassment of religious groups exists behind the Iron Curtain within the U.S.S.R.—Russia—and Eastern European countries comes as no surprise to Americans, Members of Congress, and to all free people. This persecution in varying degrees of intensity is continuing to Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens. The harassment and infringing upon the inherent rights of religions through confiscatory taxation and closing of religious institutions, deliberate suppression of religious education, interference with religious and related cultural practices, denial of regular contacts between religious bodies in their countries with similar bodies in other parts of the world must be admitted.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to state that this committee has just completed hearings on this very subject. We had extensive testimony from members of all faiths, Jewish, Muslim, Orthodox, Protestant, and Catholic on the manner in which religious persecution, both overt and covert, continues in Communist countries. The purpose of these hearings was not to be just a reminder of lest we forget nor that we thought we might be able to stop such persecution—but my reason, personally, was to expose the hypocrisy of Communist guarantees by proving that the leaders of Communist governments do not live up to their guarantees. If they would match the words of their constitutions which guarantee religious freedom to all peoples, hearings such as ours would not be necessary. They try to deny persecution exists by pointing to "showcases" of churches and synagogues being opened while all the time the countless persecution of religion goes on.

Your Subcommittee on Europe passed a resolution unanimously on this subject. It is now pending before the full Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and I hope action will be taken on this shortly. It is my hope that the governments of the Soviet Union and the governments of the eastern European countries will grant the exercise of religious rights and related cultural pursuits to all the people living within their nations.

I hope our small action will alert the governments behind the Iron Curtain that we only seek the guarantee of the rights of all peoples.

I have requested unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article which appears in the New York Times of June 14, 1965, with which I take issue. I regret that an outstanding member of the Jewish faith, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, has disagreed that persecution is taking place. I insert this article from the New York Times in the Record:

ZIONISTS DISAVOW GOLDMANN'S POSITION ON SOVIET

(By W. Granger Blair)

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL SECTOR), June 14.—The Jewish Agency for Israel has disavowed remarks made on Soviet Jews by Dr. Nahum

CPYRGH
T

Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organization.

Dr. Goldmann contended last week that public criticism and appeals for a change in Soviet treatment of Jews were ineffective, "too often being distorted" and sometimes harmful. He advocated "quiet diplomacy."

A Jewish agency spokesman said that the opinions, expressed at a news conference in New York last Thursday, were "personal and did not reflect the policies of the World Zionist Organization. The agency and the WZO have overlapping functions and aims in the promotion of Zionism."

The Jewish agency was particularly upset that Dr. Goldmann at his news conference had not repeated his statement of a month ago that all his political statements were made in a private capacity and in no way committed the World Zionist Organization.

LEADERS REPORTED UPSET

It was understood that Premier Levi Eshkol and Foreign Minister Golda Meir and their associates were also upset over the Zionist leader's comments that accusations against the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jews were often distorted.

A Jewish Agency official bemoaned the fact that "the good relations that we had built up" between the agency and key Government ministries on foreign policy questions had received a setback with Dr. Goldmann's statements.

However, this was not the first time that Dr. Goldmann has been at odds with Israeli leaders over a foreign policy question. When David Ben-Gurion was Premier the two men frequently and publicly disagreed. Under the Eshkol regime these frictions have been reduced.

Four of the five Israeli newspapers that devoted editorials today to Dr. Goldmann's New York statements took him to task. The only paper that supported his advocacy of "quiet diplomatic action" was the organ of the ultra-orthodox religious political party Agudat Israel.

One paper called his statements "most surprising and in part damaging and harmful." Another asked if "it was necessary to put a weapon into our enemies' hands by declaring that unjust accusations are being leveled against Russia."

A third asserted that "we cannot understand why at this particular time when the Jewish organizations in the United States—largely against the will of the State Department—have come out into the open to win over public opinion Dr. Goldmann comes along to stick a spoke in the wheel."

The fourth critical newspaper held that "coming in the wake of President Johnson's recent public appeal to the Soviet Government in behalf of Russian Jewry, Dr. Goldmann's statements clearly were unfortunate in their timing."

In its campaign to arouse world opinion and Jewish opinion in particular to the restrictions placed on Russian Jews the Israeli Government has always emphasized the right of Soviet Jewry to emigrate freely to Israel.

Close observers of the Israeli scene believe this emphasis reflects the desire of this country's authorities to offset the rapidly expanding backward and poorly educated Oriental Jewish communities with more progressive and better educated Jews from the West and from the Soviet Union.

WATERGATE CONCERT SHELL

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on this day of the Festival of Arts at the White House, it seems particularly appropriate

to introduce a bill for the construction of a new shell for the Watergate and other concerts on the Potomac.

As a former staff employee of the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, I am a Watergate concert fan of long standing, and as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I share the concern regarding the deterioration of the present facility.

If Washington is to remain a fitting Capitol for this great Nation, it seems imperative that we not let the Watergate tradition die. In behalf of all who are interested in a more beautiful Washington, I am happy to introduce the following bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary of the Interior, a sum not exceeding \$342,500 to construct a new and larger concert shell, with either a barge or piling foundation, for the Watergate and other concerts in Washington, D.C.

LAND ACQUISITION POLICIES SHOULD CHANGE

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to protest the land acquisition policies of the Army Corps of Engineers. The so-called negotiation policy is one which should receive a complete and immediate review. It is a policy which is doing more to create distrust of the Federal Government in certain areas of the country than anything I know. The citizen is never told what the Government's appraisal is. If he is shrewd in the ways of business, he will avoid taking the first offer. He will argue and resist and the Government will gradually come up and they might get together. But those who deserve the most protection get the least protection under this policy. The old and tired, the inexperienced in business affairs, the weak and gullible—all are taken advantage of by this policy. And then, too, Mr. Speaker, in my area of Indiana, the Government has been stingy and reluctant in their offers. In certain instances I feel quite sure that the Government will get trounced in the courts by those whose determination has taken them into the courts. Appraisals are in the hands of affected property owners giving values twice as high as that the Government has offered. These are appraisals by competent local appraisers who know better than any outsider the value of lands being bought and sold in the area. It bothers me to know that these people are taken advantage of but most of all I am disturbed by the fact these highhanded tactics are creating such bitter and resentful feelings against the Federal Government. It is understandable that the people being displaced are disturbed and distressed because the Government is interfering with their lives and in some instances their livelihood but when it is all done they should at the least have respect for the Govern-

ment and its processes and be able to say, "The Government treated me fairly."

IMPROVEMENT IN OUR LABOR LAWS

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a package of five labor bills which anticipates the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and provides for appropriate improvement in labor laws to further safeguard the public interest and bolster union democracy.

Four of these measures are designed to strengthen the collective bargaining process; provide for a secret ballot in union representation cases; further equal employment opportunities and improve machinery to deal with national emergency strikes. The fifth bill would increase the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per hour.

Parallel measures are being introduced in the other body by my distinguished colleague, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, ranking Republican on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I have long been on record against proposals which seek to abolish or diminish labor's right to self-organization and collective action. Unions have largely been a force for good in our society. But no objective person can fail to recognize the need for keeping union responsibility abreast of union authority.

Mr. Speaker, the first of the bills I am introducing today would amend the Labor-Management Relations Act to give the Federal courts jurisdiction to enforce provisions of collective bargaining agreements containing no-strike, no-lockout clauses, provided that such jurisdiction is specifically accepted in the contract and the contract contains a clause providing for the arbitration of disputes. The Supreme Court has held that the Federal courts are deprived of jurisdiction to enforce no-strike clauses regardless of what the parties themselves have negotiated.

The second bill amends the National Labor Relations Act to insure, when requested, a secret ballot election in union representation cases in lieu of a card check.

The third bill would amend the Equal Employment Opportunity title, title VII, of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to improve its coverage of unions and employers, to strengthen the enforcement and investigatory powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—similar to New York State's Commission on Human Rights—and to stress equal opportunity access to apprenticeship and other training programs.

Testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee still indicates that only about 2 percent of those engaged in apprenticeship training programs throughout the United States are Negro. Further, Negro unemployment rates are at least double those of others; and the Commission should be given the power to issue cease and desist orders,